



[> home](#) [> about](#) [> feedback](#) [> logout](#)
US Patent & Trademark Office

Citation

Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research Annual Conference [>archive](#)

Proceedings of the ACM SIGCPR conference on Management of
information systems personnel [>toc](#)
1988 , College park, Maryland, United States

Recent trends in information systems law

Authors

B. K. Esposito Univ. of Baltimore, Baltimore, MD
C. Walton Univ. of Baltimore, Baltimore, MD
S. Walton Univ. of Maryland, College Park, MD

Sponsor

SIGCPR : ACM Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research


Publisher

ACM Press New York, NY, USA

Pages: 183 - 187 Series-Proceeding-Article

Year of Publication: 1988

ISBN:0-89791-262-4


 <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/57216.57242> (Use this link to Bookmark this page)

[> full text](#) [> abstract](#) [> references](#) [> index terms](#) [> peer to peer](#)

[> Discuss](#)

[> Similar](#)

[> Review this Article](#)

 [Save to Binder](#)

[> BibTex Format](#)

[^ FULL TEXT:](#)  [Access Rules](#)

 pdf 530 KB

[^ ABSTRACT](#)

Legal issues in the information systems area have been among the more active areas of the law. Even with this activity, legislation and the courts have lagged information technology. This

recent activity effects the information systems manager. This article examines recent information legal issues in the areas of employment and personnel, corporate liability, and copyright.

↑ REFERENCES

Note: OCR errors may be found in this Reference List extracted from the full text article. ACM has opted to expose the complete List rather than only correct and linked references.

- 1 Aetna Casualty and Surety Co. v. Jeppensen & Co., 642 F. 2d. 339(9th Cir. 1981).
- 2 Mehdi Beheshtian, Computer copyright law, Journal of Systems Management, v.37 n.9, p.6-11, Sept. 1986
- 3 Brown v. United States, 599 F. Supp. 877(D. Mass. 1984) and 615 F. Supp. 391(D. Mass. 1985)
- 4 Business Intelligence Services, v. Carole Hudson, 580 F. Supp. 1068. Civil Aeronautics Board, Regulations ER-1385, Part 255(Carrier-Owned Computer Reservations Systems). Docket: 41686,(1984)p.17.
- 5 Copyright Act of 1976, Public Law 94-553, 90 Statute 2541.
- 6 Cross, J. Bruce, "what Can You Ask a Prospective Employee These Days", L~ Administrator, September-October 1987.
- 7 DePaul Law Review, Vol. 34, Summer 85, "Combating Software Piracy".
- 8 Data Processing Services, Inc. v. L.H. Smith Oil Corp., 1UCC Rep Serv 2d (Indiana Court of Appeals, 1986).
- 9 Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v, Greenmoss Builders, Inc., 105 S. CT. 2939(1985).
- 10 Federal Aviation Act, Section 411, 49 USC Sec 1381.
- 11 Federal Communications. Law_Journal, Vol. 38 (1985).
- 12 Federal Trade Commission Act, Section 515, USC Sec. 45.
- 13 Hi Neighbor Enterprises, Inc. v. Burroughs Corporation, 492 F. Supp. 823 (N.D. Fla. 1980).
- 14 Holmes, R. "Application of Article Two of the Uniform Commercial Code to Computer Systems Acquisitions", Rutgers Computer & Technoloq~ Law Journal, 9(1): 1-25; 1982.
- 15 Journal of American Insurance, "Your Computer System May Have a Split Personality", Second Quarter 1986.
- 16 Steven L. Mandell, Computers, Data Processing, and The Law, West Publishing Co., St. Paul, MN, 1984
- 17 Maxx, Peter, "The Emergence of Information Law: Strategies for IS Managers", SIM SPECTRUM, Society for Information Management, February, 1987.
- 18 Midway Manufacturing Company v. Strohon, 564 F. Supp 741.
- 19 National Commission on New Technology Uses of Copyrighted Works," Final Report, 1979.
- 20 Pope and Pope, "Protection of Proprietary Interests in Computer Software," 30 Alabama Law Review, 527, 536-537, (1979).

- 21 RRX Industries, Inc. v. Lab-Con, Inc. 772 F.2d 543(9th Cir. 1985)
- 22 Stepke, Krysten, "How to Develop Effective{and Legal) Personnel Tests", Legal Administrator, September-October 1987.
- 23 United Air Lines, Inc. v. CAB, 766 F. 2d 1107(7th Cir. 1985).
- 24 USAIR Inc. and Pacific Southwest Airlines, Inc. et. al. v. American Airlines, Inc~ and United Air Lines, Inc., No. 84-8918- ER(TX),(C.D. Cal filed Nov. 20, 1984)
- 25 Uniform Commercial Code, Article 2, Section 105.
- 26 United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 8.
- 27 Wheaton v. Petus, 33 U.S. (SPet.) 590 (1934).
- 28 Whelan Associates v. Jaslow Dental Laboratory, 609 F. Supp. 1307 (D.C. Pa. 1985)
- 29 Williams Electronic v. Arctic International, 685 F. 2d 870.

⬆ INDEX TERMS

Primary Classification:

H. Information Systems

↳ H.1 MODELS AND PRINCIPLES

↳ H.1.2 User/Machine Systems

↳ Subjects: Human factors

Additional Classification:

K. Computing Milieux

↳ K.4 COMPUTERS AND SOCIETY

↳ K.4.2 Social Issues

↳ Subjects: Employment

↳ K.5 LEGAL ASPECTS OF COMPUTING

↳ K.5.2 Governmental Issues

↳ Subjects: Regulation

↳ K.6 MANAGEMENT OF COMPUTING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS

↳ K.6.1 Project and People Management

↳ Subjects: Staffing

General Terms:

Human Factors, Legal Aspects, Management

⬆ Peer to Peer - Readers of this Article have also read:

Middleware: a model for distributed system services

Communications of the ACM 39, 2

Philip A. Bernstein

Benchmarking simple database operations

ACM SIGMOD Record 16, 3

W. B. Rubenstein , M. S. Kubicar , R. G. G. Cattell

Secure data hiding in wavelet compressed fingerprint images

Proceedings of the 2000 ACM workshops on Multimedia

Nalini K. Ratha , Jonathan H. Connell , Ruud M. Bolle

Watermarking at point of origin

Proceedings of the 2000 ACM workshops on Multimedia

Andrew Z. Tirkel , Tom E. Hall

Five roles of an information system: a social constructionist approach
to analyzing the use of ERP systems

**Proceedings of the twenty first international conference on
Information systems**

Linda Askenäs , Alf Westelius

The ACM Portal is published by the Association for Computing Machinery. Copyright © 2002 ACM, Inc.



[> home](#) [> about](#) [> feedback](#) [> logout](#)
US Patent & Trademark Office

Citation

ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS) [>archive](#)
Volume 9 , Issue 1 (March 1984) [>toc](#)

A Database Management System for the Federal Courts

Authors

Jack R. Buchanan
Richard D. Fennell


Publisher

ACM Press New York, NY, USA

Pages: 72 - 88 Periodical-Issue-Article


Year of Publication: 1984

ISSN:0362-5915

 <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/348.318587> (Use this link to Bookmark this page)


[> full text](#) [> abstract](#) [> references](#) [> index terms](#) [> peer to peer](#)

[> Discuss](#) [> Similar](#) [> Review this Article](#)

 [Save to Binder](#)

[> BibTex Format](#)

[↑ FULL TEXT:](#)  [Access Rules](#)

 [pdf 1.35 MB](#)

[↑ ABSTRACT](#)

A judicial systems laboratory has been established and several large-scale information management systems projects have been undertaken within the Federal Judicial Center in Washington, D.C. The newness of the court application area, together with the experimental nature of the initial prototypes, required that the system building tools be as flexible and efficient as possible for effective software design and development. The size of the databases, the expected transaction volumes, and the long-term value of the court records required a data manipulation system capable of providing high performance and integrity. The resulting design criteria, the programming capabilities developed, and their use in system construction are described herein. This database programming facility has been especially designed as a technical management tool for the database administrator, while providing the applications programmer

with a flexible database software interface for high productivity. Specifically, a network-type database management system using SAIL as the data manipulation host language is described. Generic data manipulation verb formats using SAIL's macro facilities and dynamic data structuring facilities allowing in-core database representations have been developed to achieve a level of flexibility not usually attained in conventional database systems.

◆ REFERENCES

Note: OCR errors may be found in this Reference List extracted from the full text article. ACM has opted to expose the complete List rather than only correct and linked references.

- 1 BACHMAN, C.W. Data structure diagrams. Database i, 2 (Summer 1969).
- 2 David Beech, A Structural View of PL/I, ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR), v.2 n.1, p.33-64, March 1970
- 3 BUCHANAN, J.R., AND FENNELL, R.D. Model directed information systems for management of the federal courts. Manage. Sci. 27, 8 {Aug. 1981}.
- 4 BUCHANAN, J.R., AND FENNELL, R.D. An intelligent information system for criminal case management in the federal courts, in Proc. 5th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence {Aug. 1977}.
- 5 BUCHANAN, J.R. Management information systems for the federal courts. In Proc. of the Conference on Interactive Information and Decision Support Systems, Office of Naval Research, Wharton School of Management, Nov. 1975.
- 6 COBOL. American National Standard programming language COBOL. X3.23-1974, American National Standards Institute, Inc., New York, 1974.
- 7 CODASYL DATABASE TASK GROUP. April 1971 Report. ACM, New York, 1971.
- 8 E. F. Codd, A relational model of data for large shared data banks, Communications of the ACM, v.13 n.6, p.377-387, June 1970
- 9 C. J. Date, An introduction to database systems: vol. I (4th ed.), Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., Boston, MA, 1986
- 10 DECsystem-10 Database Management System Programmer's Procedures Manual. Document DEC-10-APPMA-B-D, Digital Equipment Corp., Maynard, Mass., 1977.
- 11 E~ERSOLE, J.L., AND HALL, J.A. COURTRAN, an information system for the courts. J. Comput. Law, Rutgers Univ., 1972.
- 12 K. P. Eswaran , J. N. Gray , R. A. Lorie , I. L. Traiger, The notions of consistency and predicate locks in a database system, Communications of the ACM, v.19 n.11, p.624-633, Nov. 1976
- 13 FENNELL, R.D. Choosing a programming language for the implementation of large software systems. Federal Judicial Center Internal Report, April 1979.
- 14 James P. Fry , Edgar H. Sibley, Evolution of Data-Base Management Systems, ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR), v.8 n.1, p.7-42, March 1976
- 15 HULME, J. Notes on the design of the criminal database. Federal Judicial Center Internal Report, Sept. 1975.
- 16 NIHAN, C.W. COURTRAN IT, an assessment of applications and computer requirements.

Federal Judicial Center Report, Sept. 1974.

- 17 PARSONS, F.G., DALE, A.G., AND YURKANAN, C.V. Data manipulation language requirements for database management systems. Comput. J. {May 1974}.
- 18 RAPIDATA CORP. A FORTRAN DML implementation for DBMS-10. Fairfield, N.J.
- 19 SAIL User Manual. J.F. Reiser, Ed., Stanford Artificial Intelligence Laboratory Memo AIM-289, Computer Science Dept., Stanford Univ., Stanford, Calif., Aug. 1976.
- 20 SALMOND, K., AND HULME, J. A study of database management system. Federal Judicial Center Internal Report, Nov. 1975.
- 21 Hanan Samet, A Coroutine Approach to Parsing, ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS), v.2 n.3, p.290-306, July 1980
- 22 SAMET, H. Design of a macro system for high-level languages: a retrospective and prospective view. Computer Science TR-1353, Univ. of Maryland, College Park, Dec. 1983.
- 23 Speedy Trial Act, Public Law 93-619, 18 U.S.C. 3161, Jan. 1975.
- 24 STACEY, G.M. A FORTRAN interface to the CODASYL Database Task Group Specifications. Comput. J. (May 1974), 124-129.
- 25 Robert W. Taylor , Randall L. Frank, CODASYL Data-Base Management Systems, ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR), v.8 n.1, p.67-103, March 1976
- 26 D. C. Tschritzis , F. H. Lochovsky, Hierarchical Data-Base Management: A Survey, ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR), v.8 n.1, p.105-123, March 1976

↑ INDEX TERMS

Primary Classification:

A. General Literature

↗ Peer to Peer - Readers of this Article have also read:

New Products

Linux Journal 1996, 27es

CORPORATE Linux Journal Staff

Editorial pointers

Communications of the ACM 44, 9

Diane Crawford

News track

Communications of the ACM 44, 9

Robert Fox

Book Review: IPv6: The New Internet Protocol

Linux Journal 1996, 25es

CORPORATE Linux Journal Staff

Book Review: Civilizing Cyberspace
Linux Journal 1996, 28es
CORPORATE Linux Journal Staff

The ACM Portal is published by the Association for Computing Machinery. Copyright © 2002 ACM, Inc.



[> home](#) [> about](#) [> feedback](#) [> logout](#)
US Patent & Trademark Office

Citation

Annual ACM Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval [>archive](#)

Proceedings of the 23rd annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval [>toc](#)
2000 , Athens, Greece

Extracting sentence segments for text summarization: a machine learning approach

Authors

Wesley T. Chuang
Jihoon Yang

Sponsors

Athens U of Econ & Business : Athens University of Economics and Business
Greek Com Soc : Greek Computer Society
SIGIR : ACM Special Interest Group on Information Retrieval


Publisher

ACM Press New York, NY, USA

Pages: 152 - 159 Series-Proceeding-Article


Year of Publication: 2000

ISBN:1-58113-226-3

 <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/345508.345566> (Use this link to Bookmark this page)

[> full text](#) [> abstract](#) [> index terms](#) [> peer to peer](#)

[> Discuss](#) [> Similar](#) [> Review this Article](#)

 [Save to Binder](#)

[> BibTex Format](#)

 [FULL TEXT:](#)  [Access Rules](#)

 [pdf 945 KB](#)

 [ABSTRACT](#)

With the proliferation of the Internet and the huge amount of data it transfers, text summarization is becoming more important. We present an approach to the design of an automatic text summarizer that generates a summary by extracting sentence segments. First, sentences are broken into segments by special cue markers. Each segment is represented by a set of predefined features (e.g. location of the segment, average term frequencies of the words occurring in the segment, number of title words in the segment, and the like). Then a supervised learning algorithm is used to train the summarizer to extract *important* sentence segments, based on the feature vector. Results of experiments on U.S. patents indicate that the performance of the proposed approach compares very favorably with other approaches (including Microsoft Word summarizer) in terms of precision, recall, and classification accuracy.

↑ INDEX TERMS

Primary Classification:

H. Information Systems

↳ H.3 INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL

↳ H.3.1 Content Analysis and Indexing

↳ Subjects: Abstracting methods

Additional Classification:

I. Computing Methodologies

↳ I.2 ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

↳ I.2.7 Natural Language Processing

↳ Subjects: Text analysis

General Terms:

Algorithms, Experimentation, Performance, Reliability, Theory

Keywords:

machine learning, sentence segment extraction, text summarization

↑ Peer to Peer - Readers of this Article have also read:

Developing and delivering a data warehousing and mining course

Communications of the AIS 2, 3es

Elizabeth M. Pierce

Object oriented relational database with SQL interface

Proceedings of the 1993 ACM conference on Computer science

Behrooz Seyed-Abbassi

Temporal statement modifiers

ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS) 25, 4

Michael H. Böhlen , Christian S. Jensen , Richard T. Snodgrass

OCELOT: a system for summarizing Web pages

Proceedings of the 23rd annual international ACM SIGIR

**conference on Research and development in information
retrieval**

Adam L. Berger , Vibhu O. Mittal

Building a scalable and accurate copy detection mechanism

**Proceedings of the first ACM international conference on Digital
libraries**

Narayanan Shivakumar , Hector Garcia-Molina

The ACM Portal is published by the Association for Computing Machinery. Copyright © 2002 ACM, Inc.

on a printed work:

1. Place the following notice on *all* copies of the work to be copyrighted:

"Copyright © 19— by John Smith."

(This assumes that John Smith is the proprietor.)

2. Place the notice on the title page. (Sometimes it is difficult to ascertain which page is the title page.)

3. Don't release any copies without the copyright notice. (Sometimes a few releases are not fatal.)

4. Study Library of Congress release SML-47 [see *Comm. ACM*, 6, 7 (July 1964), 450.]

REFERENCES

1. MACDONALD, J. Technological advances and copyright. *Bul. Copy. Soc. of the U.S.A.* 8, 3.
2. SEIDEL, A. H. Antitrust, patent and copyright law implications of computer technology. *J. Patent Off. Soc.* 44, 2 (Feb. 1962), 116-125.
3. LAWLOR, R. C. Information technology and the law. In *Advances in Computers*, Vol. 3, Academic Press, 1962, 299-352.
4. U. S. Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 8, cl. 8.
5. 17 U.S. Code 1.
6. 17 U.S. Code 4.

7. *Capitol Records, Inc. v. Mercury*, 221 F (2) 657, 105 USPQ 163.
8. *White-Smith Music Pub. Co. v. Apollo Co.*, 209 U.S. 1.
9. 17 U.S. Code 1(e).
10. H.R. Rep. No. 2222, 60th Cong. 2d Sess. 9 (1909). (See *Nimmer on Copyright*, App. 1, or *Howell's Copyright Law*, App. C.)
11. NIMMER, M. B. *Nimmer on Copyright*. Sec. 108, Note 237, Matthew Bender & Co., Inc., 1963.
12. *Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Corp. v. Bijou Theatre Co.*, 59 F (2) 70, 77, 13 USPQ 147.
13. *Corcoran v. Montgomery Ward & Co.*, 121 F. 2d 572 (9th Cir. 1941).
14. Statement of the Committee on Copyright of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York with respect to H.R. 3589 in Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 82nd Congress.
15. Report No. 1160 to accompany H.R. 3589, 82nd Congress, first session.
16. *Kipling v. G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 120 F. 631.
17. *Leon v. Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co.*, 91 F. 2d 484 (9th Cir. 1937).
18. *Ricordi v. Mason*, 201 F. 184, 210 F. 277 (C.A. 2, 1913); but see *MacMillan Co. v. King*, 223 F. 862.
19. For discussion, see *Nimmer on Copyright*, Sec. 50; *Howell's Copyright Law*, p. 66.

Computer Patent Disclosures

Joseph P. Kates*

Suppose a potentially very valuable experimental multi-computer system is being designed by you and your group. You feel you have made at least a system invention. In your Company scientists and engineers are responsible for initiating invention disclosures.

What should your patent disclosure entail? How much time should you spend in preparing the disclosure? hours? days? weeks? Should you prepare a simplified system disclosure, or should you provide a detailed disclosure of the logical design? Will logic equations alone suffice? Manufacture and debugging may take a year or more.

In this case you should consult with your patent attorney as to patent protection for your invention. Such an invention very possibly will be involved in interference and/or litigation. Interference occurs when two parties have filed an application on the same invention, both claiming to be the first inventor. The first applicant who files a patent application is the senior party in the interference, and a later filing applicant has the burden of proving that he is the first inventor. The winner will be the first (1) to conceive and either diligently reduce to practice constructively by the filing of a patent application or actually by building a successfully operated and tested machine, or (2) to conceive first, and with or without diligence, to first reduce to practice. The difficulty of

proving actual reduction to practice is usually immense and is aggravated in a computer case. For example, consider the following situations.

1. Ninety percent of the elements are reduced to practice by those problems proved to be tested on the machine. There is no record that the remaining ten percent were tested. Elements of the counts contested in interference are among the ten percent—you lose.

2. A computer requires a high order of accuracy. Test results not conclusive of achieving such accuracy would negate actual reduction to practice.

3. The rules are stringent that the invention worked as intended to work in its practical contemplated use. For example, a binary counter which provided good waveforms on an oscilloscope was adjudged not reduced to practice since the record did not establish that the oscilloscope provided an actual load impedance [Elmore V. Schmitt, 278 F2d 510, 125 USPQ 653, May 10, 1960].

For these reasons I am convinced that long and short range savings will result by early filing before actual reduction to practice of applications which are as well disclosed as possible. I advise against spending much engineering time on the preliminary disclosure. Broadly outlined management proposals, block system drawings and available technical reports suffice for the early technical disclosure at this point. However, fill out the history form, where provided, carefully for potential legal necessity.

* Patent Attorney, Burroughs Corporation Paoli, Pa. This paper was presented at a panel discussion in the 1964 Spring Joint Computer Conference, Washington, D. C.

Although workable in a circuit case, I do not believe that logic equations alone can, in a systems case supply a complete disclosure. To expect the attorney to prepare the patent for an invention from logical equations alone would in most cases lead to loss of, and often would fail to disclose the invention. I am convinced that preparation of an adequate and operative disclosure is necessary. In a computer systems case it must be a cooperative endeavor between the scientists and the patent attorney.

A patent application generally contains an introduction, objects of the invention, prior art problems and disadvantages, advantages of your invention, identification of the drawing figures, then a detailed description by structure and operation of the drawings, claims and legal papers. In a computer application the operational description may also include programs, logic, mathematics, operation in executing exemplary instructions, subroutines, description of arithmetic unit operations and separate descriptions of units such as the processors.

What should you furnish your patent attorney? First, supply drawings. The essential drawings include system and subsystem block diagrams, pictorial views, schematics of those electrical and logical circuits resulting from substantial design problems, formats of commands, of program and of data words, functional diagrams of sequence of operations and carrying out of instructions, wiring diagrams of communications between and within the units and cabinets, special novel features and timing diagrams.

Err on the side of too much. Your attorney and you in conference can best weed out unnecessary drawings.

The description of the drawings can be a combination of oral discussions between the scientists and programmers involved and the patent attorney. One effective way is dictation on recording machines by the attorney in discussions with the cognizant scientists. Supplement the verbal material by seeing that your patent attorney is listed to receive technical and management reports, proposals and instruction books as these are produced. Usually material which the technical writer can use is also useful to the patent attorney.

The principal source of information, however, throughout preparation of a massive patent application, is you. You can best help by being available as needed by the attorney for continuous but intermittent instruction. In that regard, it is not necessary that the inventors do all the work. The names of persons cognizant with details and their specialties will be very helpful to your patent attorney to avoid loss of your time. In order for your patent lawyer to secure a valid and enforceable computer patent, the patent application he prepares and prosecutes for you must contain sufficient disclosure within this document to teach other computer scientists to practice the invention. Disclosure of all the technical details and of the circumstances of the invention will enable his advance preparation and planning to properly claim and plead your cause for your valid and enforceable patent.

Joint Inventorship of Computers

Gunter A. Hauptman*

The term *joint inventorship* asks but does not necessarily answer the question, "Who is the true inventor of a computer?" I will try to show how "wrong" inventors are joined, how such improper joinder can be avoided, and its dangers. While the law permits the addition or subtraction of improperly joined inventors, it does not permit the substitution of one set of inventors for another set of inventors. Thus, despite corrective weapons, there are some pitfalls which must be avoided.

As an introduction let us consider the development of a hypothetical computer to see how joint invention problems arise. Initially, some engineers get together and say, "Let's build a multiplying computer." One engineer, the mathematician of the group, blocks out the desired multiplication technique; it is new. Several other engineers design registers and adders which are based on well-known concepts; and still another man designs the controls for

permitting the registers and adders to interact in accordance with the mathematician's multiplication technique. All the engineers go to a patent attorney who, based on their work, drafts a patent application directed to the novel multiplying technique as executed by the old registers and adders under command of the novel controls. Assuming that the mathematician and controls designer are joint inventors, should the engineers who designed the registers and adders be included as joint inventors? The answer is probably no, but the answer would be a qualified yes if the registers and adders were novel—qualified because separate patent applications would probably be required for each device. What if the original case were filed with the mathematician and controls designer as inventors and it soon turned out that though the multiplication technique and controls were old, the adders were, after all, new? Can the originally named joint inventors be dropped and the engineer who designed the adders be added? Probably not!

Since in a real-life computer development group it is not possible to join everybody in every patent application

* Patent Staff Attorney, IBM Corporation, New York, N. Y. This paper was presented at a panel discussion in the 1964 Spring Joint Computer Conference, Washington, D. C.



[> home](#) [> about](#) [> feedback](#) [> logout](#)
US Patent & Trademark Office

Citation

Communications of the ACM [>archive](#)
Volume 7 , Issue 10 (October 1964) [>toc](#)

Computer patent disclosures

Author

Joseph P. Kates Burroughs Corporation, Paoli, PA


Publisher

ACM Press New York, NY, USA

Pages: 578 - 579 Periodical-Issue-Article


Year of Publication: 1964

ISSN:0001-0782

 <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/364888.364904> (Use this link to Bookmark this page)


[> full text](#) [> abstract](#) [> index terms](#) [> peer to peer](#)

[> Discuss](#) [> Similar](#) [> Review this Article](#)

 [Save to Binder](#)

[> BibTex Format](#)

[↑ FULL TEXT:](#)  [Access Rules](#)

 [pdf 242 KB](#)

[↑ ABSTRACT](#)

Suppose a potentially very valuable experimental multi-computer system is being designed by you and your group. You feel you have made at least a system invention. In your Company scientists and engineers are responsible for initiating invention disclosures.

[↑ INDEX TERMS](#)

Primary Classification:

K. Computing Milieux

↳ K.5 LEGAL ASPECTS OF COMPUTING

↳ K.5.1 Hardware/Software Protection

↳ Subjects: Patents

General Terms:

Design, Legal Aspects, Performance, Theory

✦ Peer to Peer - Readers of this Article have also read:

Monotonic reductions, representative equivalence, and compilation of intractable problems

Journal of the ACM (JACM) 48, 6

Paolo Liberatore

Gate sizing with controlled displacement

Proceedings of the 1999 international symposium on Physical design

Wei Chen , Cheng-Ta Hsieh , Massoud Pedram

Authors

Communications of the ACM 31, 1

Rosalie Steier

Implicit Data Structures for the Dictionary Problem

Journal of the ACM (JACM) 30, 1

Greg N. Frederickson

Certification of algorithm 236 [S17]: Bessel functions of the first kind

Communications of the ACM 8, 2

Walter Gautschi